

Remarks/Arguments

A. Claims in the Case

Claims 1160-1164 are pending. Claims 1160-1164 are rejected. Claims 1160 and 1163-1164 have been amended. Claims 1288-1302 are new.

B. Amendments

Applicant submits that the amendments made to the specification were made to correct typographical errors. Furthermore, Applicant submits no new matter was added to the specification.

Applicant submits that the amendments made to the drawings were made to correct typographical errors and for clarification. Furthermore, Applicant submits that no new matter was added to the specification.

C. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Kachel et al. In View of Greshes Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1160-1164 as being unpatentable over European Patent Number EP 381 164 to Kachel et al. (hereinafter “Kachel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,074,579 to Greshes. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

In order to reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner et al.*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173, 177-178 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP § 2143.03.

Amended claim 1160 states:

A computer-implemented method for displaying the status of an eyeglass lens forming apparatus, the eyeglass lens forming apparatus comprising a curing unit configured to apply light and heat to a mold assembly; the method comprising:

monitoring a parameter of at least one component of the curing unit;

displaying the status of the monitored components of the curing unit on a display device, wherein the displayed status is based on the monitored parameter;

comparing the monitored parameter to a predetermined range for the monitored parameter for at least one monitored component; and

displaying an error message if the monitored parameter is outside of a predetermined acceptable range for the monitored parameter.

Support for the amendments is found in Applicant's specification, which states in part:

Furthermore, controller computer 2002 may be configured to monitor a parameter of at least one instrument coupled to the first curing unit during curing of a lens forming composition in the first curing unit. In addition, the controller computer may be configured to compare the monitored parameter to an acceptable range for the parameter and to display an error message if the monitored parameter is outside of the acceptable range. In this manner, the controller computer may be configured to monitor a curing process in situ and to provide real-time information to a user of the lens forming apparatus.

(Specification, page 139, lines 4-11).

Additionally, the controller may provide system diagnostics to determine if the system is operating properly. The controller may notify the user when routine maintenance is due or when a system error is detected. The system monitors the following conditions to warn the user when the machine has malfunctioned, requires standard maintenance, or is drifting out of its suggested operating envelope: I²C network errors; line voltage; top rack light intensity; bottom rack light intensity; post-cure rack light intensity; top activating light ballast current; bottom activating light ballast current; post-cure activating light ballast current; germicidal light ballast current; post-cure heater current; top activating light filament heat transformer current; bottom activating light filament heat transformer current; germicidal light filament heat transformer current; the number of times the top activating light is turned on; the number of times the bottom activating light is turned on; the number of times the post-cure activating light is turned on; the number of times the germicidal light is turned on; top

activating light on time; bottom activating light on time; post cure activating light on time; germicidal light on time; top lamp temperature; bottom lamp temperature; spin board temperature; post-cure temperature.
(Specification, page 36, lines 11-26)

The Office Action states in part:

European-318 discloses a computer controlled process for casting monomeric formulation....this reference essentially lacking a clear disclosure of monitoring and displaying the status of the curing unit...and also that the curing would involve heating as well light radiation....Greshes-579 discloses a computer implemented method for controlling and displaying hot air temperatures during the formation of an eyeglass lens using a computer controlled and programmed press.....Given the state of the art in computer controls, bar graph indicators (ie, picture representations) using different colors showing the temperature and extent of cure of a lens formulation or tables indicating the same thing would not be beyond the realm of one of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed a visit to any computer controlled facility shows screens displaying information in such a format to be nothing by conventional and well known in the molding art.

Applicant submits that Greshes does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of the features of the claim, including, but not limited to, “comparing the monitored parameter to a predetermined range for the monitored parameter for at least one monitored component.”

Greshes appears to teach displaying a temperature of a mold. For example, Greshes states:

The hot air temperatures are accurately controlled by suitable temperature gauges or sensors (not shown) on the molds which are wired to the control console 29 so that same [temperature] can then be observed and monitored
(Greshes, Column 5, lines 50-54).

A suitable temperature gauge 25, such as Model GM made by the U.S. Sensotec Company may be employed in the control console 29 (See Fig. 12)
(Greshes, Column 6, lines 4-5).

Applicant submits that the combination of Kachel and Greshes does not appear to teach the feature of the claims, including, but not limited to, “comparing the monitored parameter to a predetermined range for the monitored parameter for at least one monitored component.” As such, Applicant submits that independent claim 1160 is patentable over Kachel in view of

Greshes.

Claim 1161 states in part, “wherein displaying the status of the components of the curing unit comprises displaying a picture representative of the component and wherein the picture of the component is colored to indicate the machine-status of the component.” Applicant submits that the features of claim 1161, in combination with the features of independent claim 1160, do not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.

Claim 1162 states in part, “wherein displaying the status of the components of the curing unit comprises displaying a table with a listing of the components and wherein the table includes an indication of the machine-status of the component.” Applicant submits the features of claim 1162, in combination with the features of the independent claim 1160, do not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.

Amended claim 1163 states in part, “ wherein the components comprise a heating system of the curing unit.” Applicant submits the features of claim 1163, in combination with the features of the independent claim 1160, do not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.

Amended claim 1164 states in part, “wherein the components comprise an activating light system of the curing unit.” Applicant submits the features of claim 1164, in combination with the features of the independent claim 1160, do not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited art.


Applicant submits that monitoring and displaying the status of the components as recited in claims 1160-1164 are not obvious matters of choice or design. Pursuant to MPEP 2144.03, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide support for his assertions of obvious matter of choice or design, either by an affidavit or by references brought to the Applicant’s attention. Otherwise, Applicants request this rejection be removed. *See, e.g.*, MPEP 2143.01.

D. Additional Remarks

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration.

Applicant respectfully requests a three-month extension of time. If any additional extension of time is necessary, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. A Fee Authorization is enclosed for the extension of time fee. If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required, please charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5040-06323/EBM

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Eric B. Meyertons', written over a horizontal line.

Eric B. Meyertons
Reg. No. 34,876

Attorney for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT, & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: March 30, 2004